

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment the claims under consideration are 1-27. Both of independent Claims 1 and 27 have been amended to make clear that aspect of the present invention wherein two different types of superabsorbent material are used intermittently within one layer of the composite. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-14, 17-20, and 22-23 have further been amended in keeping with the language of the independent Claims and to obviate certain formal rejections in order to expedite prosecution. Claims 28-30 have been removed from consideration hereby. The amendments are supported at least at pages 16-17 of the specification. No new matter is added hereby. The Detailed Action of 26 August 2003 will now be addressed with reference to the headings and any paragraph numbers therein.

**35 USC § 112**

Per paragraph 4 of the Detailed Action, Claims 3 and 14 stand rejected as indefinite for use of the word “such.” The amended Claims have removed the complained-of word.

Per paragraph 5 of the Detailed Action, Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 17 and 18 stand rejected as indefinite for use of the word “type.” The subject Claims have been amended thus removing the complained-of word.

Therefore, all rejections under § 112 should now be obviated.

**35 USC § 102**

Per paragraph 7 of the Detailed Action, Claims 1-11, 13-22 and 24-30 stand

rejected as anticipated by Erspamer (WO 01/35886 A1).

It is noted that the Claims as amended are now drawn to a layered web wherein one of said layers contains zones of differing superabsorbent materials.

After extensive review Erspamer, and the numerous material examples therein, Applicants believe that Erspamer teaches only using the same type of superabsorbent material in differing amounts (i.e., “content” as defined in Erspamer at page 17, line 9) when making striped “zones” for its strata. Thus, Erspamer does not teach the use of two different superabsorbent materials within one layer, only two different amounts.

It is therefore believed that the present rejections have been obviated.

Per paragraph 8 of the Detailed Action, Claims 1, 12, and 23 stand rejected as anticipated by Rosenfeld (EP 1,110,528 A2). It is the contention of the Detailed Action that Rosenfeld shows zones of high absorbency within a material layer. However, Rosenfeld teaches the use of only a single type of superabsorbent material in any one layer. The Claims as presently amended now require a layered web wherein one of said layers contains zones of differing superabsorbent materials. The Claims thus now adequately define over the single superabsorbent material usage per layer as taught in Rosenfeld.

Applicants therefore believe that the present rejections have been obviated.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Claims as presently amended are believed to be allowable over the art of record. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned attorney should the Examiner feel that any issues remain after entry of the present amendment.

Favorable consideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Roland W. Norris".

Roland W. Norris  
Reg. No. 32,799

Pauley Petersen & Erickson  
2800 West Higgins Road  
Suite 365  
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195  
(847) 490-1400  
FAX (847) 490-1403